

EXHIBIT A

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

MICHAEL SEIDENSTEIN, Individually and	§	
On Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	Civil Action No. 3:13-CV-00917-M
	§	
ANHEUSER-BUSCH COMPANIES, LLC,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	

**DECLARATION OF MARCUS S. TOPEL IN SUPPORT OF ANHEUSER-BUSCH
COMPANIES, LLC'S OPPOSITION TO STAY PENDING DECISION OF JUDICIAL
PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**

1. I am an attorney authorized to practice in the courts of California and in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas. I am a partner of Kasowitz, Benson, Torres & Friedman, LLP, counsel for Anheuser-Busch Companies, LLC ("Anheuser-Busch") in these proceedings. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated herein and if required could and would testify under oath.

2. Plaintiff filed a putative class action in this matter on February 28, 2012. Within one week of the filing of the complaint in this action, other complaints were filed in federal district courts in five other states and in state courts in Missouri and Florida.

3. The Mills Law Firm of San Rafael, California, is counsel of record in two of the six federal lawsuits and one state lawsuit, and has spoken to the press on behalf of all federal lawsuits. As part of the media campaign, Josh Boxer, an attorney for the Mills Law Firm, informed the media that he was the lead attorney coordinating the lawsuits in various states. Mr. Boxer and other counsel representing plaintiffs gave numerous statements to many media outlets. These out of court statements by counsel generated significant nationwide publicity and negative

news coverage. Plaintiff's counsel in the instant case made no such statement to the press. Attached hereto as Exhibit A1 is a true and correct copy of a compilation of media statements by counsel for plaintiffs regarding this lawsuit.

4. Anheuser-Busch has acted expeditiously not only in responding to the complaint in this action, but in the other actions as well. Anheuser-Busch requested a very short 14-day extension of time to respond to the complaint in the other actions in order to allow it to assess the complex and unique individual state law issues in each state prior to filing motions to dismiss. Anheuser-Busch's responsive pleadings will be filed by April 8, 2013. The only federal case in which Anheuser-Busch will not file a motion to dismiss by April 8, 2013 is in Ohio. The case in Ohio is on a different briefing schedule because the plaintiffs in the Ohio action neglected to serve the complaint until very recently.

5. After Anheuser-Busch filed its motion to dismiss in this action, plaintiffs filed a motion before the JPML on March 22, 2013. Anheuser-Busch's answer to the MDL motion is due April 15, 2013, at which time it will file a brief in opposition to plaintiffs' motion seeking MDL status. The JPML has not yet set a date for adjudicating plaintiffs' motion. The JPML does not meet next until May 30, 2013. It is also quite possible that the motion before the JPML will not be heard until its following session on July 25, 2013.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 3rd day of April, 2013.

By: /s/ Marcus S. Topel